

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 8-20 are all the claims pending in the application. This Response, submitted in reply to the Office Action dated May 27, 2009, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 6, 8-13, 16-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Huggins (U.S. Publication 2004/0225743) in view of Stirpe (U.S. Publication 2002/0087496) further in view of Roelens (U.S. Publication 2005/0021811) further in view of Joao (U.S. Publication 2003/0110215) further in view of Theall (U.S. Publication 2005/0108619). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

A method for creating a presentation including interactive media relating to polls or quizzes, wherein the presentation is divided into a plurality of sections, said method comprising:

creating user polls and quizzes on a remote server...

sequentially displaying said video frame by frame on a display device, starting from an initial video frame of said video stream;

adding placeholder slides corresponding to at least one of user polls, quizzes and website links, which are accessible via the remote server;

uploading the presentation into the remote server which is accessible to end-users;...

replacing each place holder slide with at least one of a website link, a poll selected from the list of available polls and quizzes stored on the remote server, and a quiz selected from the list of available polls and quizzes stored on the remote server

In other words, an exemplary method consistent with claim 1 includes creating a number of polls and quizzes on a remote server, adding place holder slides, which correspond to the user

polls, and quizzes, or a website link, uploading the presentation onto the remote server, and replacing the place holder slides with the polls, quizzes, or websites stored on the remote server.

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner selectively maps features from the claims onto the different references applied without regard to the entire context of the claim and Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has thereby misconstrued the applied references. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that Huggins teaches adding place holder slides, but acknowledges that Huggins does not teach creating polls and quizzes, or replacing place holder slides with a corresponding quiz or poll as claimed. Instead, the Examiner asserts that Stirpe teaches these features. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has misconstrued the applied references.

Huggins is directed to a streaming media creation tool. With respect to the claimed “adding place holder slides corresponding to at least one of user polls, quizzes, and website links...”, the Examiner refers to Fig. 10 without any further argument or explanation. However, Fig. 10 merely shows an exemplary screen capture of the media creation tool and provides no teachings regarding adding a place holder slide, which corresponds to any other file or object. Fig. 10 at best shows a screen which can be used to add slides, but fails to teach adding a slide to serve as a place holder. Further, the Examiner acknowledges that Huggins does not provide any teachings regarding creating a poll or quiz, or even inserting a pre-existing poll or quiz into a presentation. Further, Applicant notes that Huggins provides no teachings regarding any aspect of polls or quizzes. Further, the Huggins also does not provide any teachings regarding inserting Websites either. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that if Huggins provides no teachings regarding polls and quizzes, Huggins cannot teach or even suggest “adding placeholder slides

corresponding to at least one of user polls, quizzes and website links, which are accessible via the remote server”.

Further, the Examiner asserts that Stirpe teaches creating polls and quizzes on a remote server and replacing placeholder slides with a website link, poll, or quiz selected from a list of available polls and quizzes stored on the remote server. However, Applicant respectfully submits that Stripe actually provides no teachings regarding “replacing place holder slides” as claimed. Instead, Stirpe actually teaches incorporating polling and/or testing directly when the presentation is being created. *See* Paragraph [0107], lines 1-6. In other words, Stirpe actually teaches the question/poll being inserted directly when the presentation is created and thus does not teach “replacing each place holder slide with at least one of a website link, a poll selected from the list of available polls and quizzes stored on the remote server, and a quiz selected from the list of available polls and quizzes stored on the remote server” as claimed. Further, if the questions/polls are inserted directly, no place holder slide is being inserted into the presentation. Thus, Stirpe not only fails to teach “replacing each place holder slide with at least one of a website link, a poll selected from the list of available polls and quizzes stored on the remote server, and a quiz selected from the list of available polls and quizzes stored on the remote server”, Stirpe also fails to teach or even fairly suggest inserting “placeholder slides

corresponding to at least one of user polls, quizzes and website links, which are accessible via the remote server”. Thus, Stirpe cannot cure the above discussed deficiencies of Huggins.

None of the other applied references teaches or even fairly suggests “adding placeholder slides **corresponding to at least one of user polls, quizzes and website links, which are accessible via the remote server”**. Further, none of the other applied references teaches or even fairly suggests “replacing each place holder slide with at least one of a website link, a poll

selected from the list of available polls and quizzes stored on the remote server, and a quiz selected from the list of available polls and quizzes stored on the remote server”. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, and all claims dependent thereon, are patentable over the applied references for at least this reason.

Further, claim 1 also recites, *inter alia*:

recording information regarding an end-user’s usage of said presentation, said information including the end-user’s identity, how far the end-user watched said presentation, what the end user has scored on a quiz, feedback provided by the end-user on a poll, and how much elapsed time the end-user spent viewing each of the plurality of sections of the presentation

In other words, the exemplary method consistent with claim 1 also involves recording information regarding the end-user’s identify, how far the end-user watched said presentation, what the user scored on a quiz, feedback provided by the end-user on a poll, and how much time the user spent viewing each of the plurality of sections of the presentation.

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner acknowledges that Huggins, Stirpe, and Roelens all fail to teach these features. Instead, the Examiner asserts that paragraphs [0036] and [0041] of Joao teach this feature. However, the Examiner also acknowledges that Huggins, Stirpe, Roelens, and Joao all fail to teach the presentation being divided into a plurality of sections and asserts that Theall teaches this feature. Again, the Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has misconstrued the applied references.

The paragraphs of Joao relied on by the Examiner merely describe a central processing computer being able to monitor the user’s progress, i.e. what the student has viewed to monitor progression through the course/presentation materials. *See* Paragraph [0041]. However, claim 1 recites a number of specific features that are monitored and recorded, in addition to how far the end-user has watched said presentation. Specifically, quiz scores and user poll feedback is also

recorded. Further, how much elapsed time the end-user spent viewing each of the plurality of sections of the presentation is also recorded.

Joao provides no teachings regarding recording the user's quiz scores or poll result feedback as claimed. Further, Joao not only fails to provide any teachings regarding recording how much elapsed time an end user spent viewing the presentation, but, as the Examiner acknowledges, Joao does not teach or suggest the presentation being divided into sections. If Joao does not teach or suggest the presentation being divided into sections, Joao cannot teach or even suggest recording "how much elapsed time the end-user spent viewing **each of the plurality of sections of the presentation**".

Further, neither Roelens, nor any of the other applied references teaches recording the specific information recited in claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, and all claims dependant thereon are patentable over the applied references for these additional reasons. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Claim 2

Claim 2 recites, *inter alia*:

A method for playing a presentation including polls or quizzes, wherein the presentation is divided into a plurality of sections, said method comprising:

... sequentially playing the frames, starting from an initial frame of the stream of data;

selecting from a table of contents being displayed on a display device of a local computer, content related to at least one of a poll and a quiz to be accessed by the end user;

pausing said stream of data when one of the frames contains placeholder data related to at least one of a poll and a quiz stored on the remote server;

displaying the at least one of a poll and a quiz to be accessed by an end-user;

recording information regarding an end-user's usage of said presentation, said information including **an end-user's identity, how far the end-user watched said**

presentation, what the end user has scored on a quiz, feedback provided by the end user on a poll, how much time the end-user spent watching said presentation and how much elapsed time the end-user spent viewing each of the plurality of sections of the presentation.

As discussed above, the applied references fail to teach or even fairly suggest the features highlighted above. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 2, and all claims dependent thereon are patentable for reasons analogous to those discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 3

Claim 3 recites, *inter alia*:

A method of communicating between a presentation program; said program being stored on a computer readable medium executable by computer, and a remote server including interactive media when a presentation is being viewed by a user, said method comprising:...

receiving a stream of data from the server, **including placeholder data related to at least one of a poll and a quiz to be accessed by a user;**

pausing the stream of data when the placeholder data related to at least one of a poll and a quiz is received;

retrieving the at least one poll and quiz related to the received placeholder data from the remote server...

recording information regarding each user's usage of said presentation, wherein said information **includes a user's identity, how far the user watched said presentation, what the user has scored on a quiz, feedback provided by the user on a poll, , and how much elapsed time the user spent viewing each of the plurality of sections of the presentation...**

As discussed above, the applied references fail to teach or even fairly suggest the features highlighted above. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 3, and all claims dependent thereon are patentable over the applied references for reasons analogous to those discussed above.

Claims 4, 5, 14, and 15

Claims 4 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Huggins in view of Stirpe further in view of Roelens further in view of Joao further in view

of Theall, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Coughlin (U.S. Publication 2003/0034999). Further, claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Huggins in view of Stirpe further in view of Roelens further in view of Joao further in view of Theall as applied to claim 1 above, further in view of Mills (U.S. Publication 2004/0010470). Further, claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Huggins in view of Stirpe further in view of Roelens further in view of Joao further in view of Theall further in view of Coughlin as applied to claim 14 above, further in view of Mills. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 4, 5, 14, and 15 all depend from claims 1 and 3, which have been shown above to be patentable over the above discussed references. Coughlin and Mills do not cure the deficiencies of the other references. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency and respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880 via EFS payment screen. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael C. Jones/
Michael C. Jones
Registration No. 63,266

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 27, 2009